

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on February 24, 2015, at 6:05 p.m., in the Council Work Session Room, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present: Councilmembers: Brian Duncan (arrived at: 6:11 p.m.)  
Mike Gailey  
Craig A. Johnson  
Karianne Lisonbee  
Douglas Peterson

Mayor Terry Palmer  
City Manager Brody Bovero  
City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown

City Employees Present:  
Finance Director Steve Marshall  
Police Chief Garret Atkin  
Fire Chief Eric Froerer  
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson  
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley  
Sewer Superintendent Daryl Webb  
City Planner Jenny Schow

The purpose of the Work Session was to hear public comments; receive annually required Open and Public Meetings Act Training; hold a Shared Solution Land Use discussion; discuss Debt Reduction/Park Funding options; review the Concept Plan for Monterey Estates Phases 6 and 7; receive a Sewer System Management Plan presentation; receive an Efficiency Audit Update; and discuss Council business.

6:04:41 PM

**Public comments**

There were no public comments.

\*\*The audio recording of the meeting failed from 6:05 p.m. to 6:19 p.m.\*\*

6:19:17 PM

**Open and Public Meetings Act Training**

City Attorney Clint Drake provided the annual required Open and Public Meetings and Act Training to the City Council. Other Commissions and Board were informed of the meeting and were invited to attend to receive the training. There was brief general discussion of the requirements of the Act throughout the training. There was a brief focus on allowing public comments throughout open and public meetings. There was also a brief focus on the Government Records Access and Management Act (GRAMA) and the relation between electronic meetings and group email threads.

6:46:21 PM

**Shared Solution Land Use Discussion**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained The Shared Solution Coalition has approached Davis County municipalities with an alternative proposal to the West Davis Corridor Highway. The Utah Department of Transportation has asked these Cities to determine if the Shared Solution land use assumptions are reasonable and feasible for Syracuse City. If the cities indicate that the Shared Solution land use assumptions are feasible and reasonable, UDOT will run additional tests to see if the other assumptions made by Shared Solutions are also feasible and reasonable. If the Shared Solutions alternative passes the additional testing, it would become Scenario #47. If UDOT then indicates that #47 would become the preferred alternative, UDOT will be returning to the cities requiring them to amend their land uses to reflect the Shared Solutions alternative before the final determination can be made on the selection of the preferred scenario and final decision. The memo noted the objective is to determine if the Shared Solution land use assumptions are reasonable and feasible for Syracuse City through resolution at the March 10, 2015 City Council Meeting.

The Syracuse City Planning Commission made a unanimous motion on February 17, 2015 in their regular meeting to recommend denial, to the City Council, for the Shared Solution land use proposal and have determined that it is not reasonable and feasible for Syracuse City.

6:46:35 PM

City Manager Bovero summarized the staff memo.

Council discussion ensued. Councilmember Duncan supported the Planning Commission due to the fact that supporting the Shared Solution would mean that the City would lose control of how the City will develop in the future, specifically along the main corridors in Syracuse. Councilmember Johnson agreed. He noted the Shared Solution was a good concept initially, but those that started the concept lost control of it because other agendas were inserted and it became something the City cannot support. He concluded the Shared Solution is not reasonable or feasible for the City. Councilmember Lisonbee agreed and indicated that she initially liked the Shared Solution option, but what is now troubling to her is that UDOT has now said that it is a massive plan to basically reorganize on a wholesale basis 10 different communities. On its face, she loves Shared Solution and would love to support it, but she cannot support the details and the high density land use that comes along with it. She noted she asked UDOT if the Council could pick and choose sections of the Shared Solution concept. Councilmember Duncan stated he would like the answer to that question and wondered if the Council can adopt a resolution indicating the City is in favor of the concept, but not the implications of the concept. Mayor Palmer stated that UDOT is asking for the City to answer two questions. Councilmember Lisonbee stated she does not feel the Council can answer the two questions because they have not been posed correctly. Mayor Palmer stated the Council is asked if the assumptions of the Shared Solution are correct and he indicated he does not feel they are. Debate and discussion of the Shared Solution assumption and implications ensued, and the Council ultimately concluded to take action at the next Council business meeting and ensure that the Council's position regarding the Shared Solution is clearly communicated to UDOT. Staff asked the Council to submit their opinions regarding the Shared Solution prior to the next meeting in order to include those opinions in the resolution or letter adopted by the Council to be submitted to UDOT. Councilmember Lisonbee stated she would like the City's position to indicate that the Council is willing to work with other communities to solve traffic problems, but they do not want an outside organization telling the community how to master plan the area for the future.

The work session meeting recessed at 7:05:32 PM to allow the Council to convene special meeting.

The work session meeting reconvened at

7:16:20 PM

**Debt Reduction/Park Funding Discussion**

7:16:32 PM

Mayor Palmer used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to provide his position regarding his proposed use of \$500,000 of surplus money currently contained in the City's General Fund Balance. Per Utah Code section 10-6-116 sections 2 & 4, the general fund balance is required to be between 5 – 25% of the final revenues for that fiscal year. General Fund balance at June 30, 2014 = \$2,145,746. The FY2014 final revenues = \$9,632,109. Fund balance = 22.3%. Projected increase in fund balance of \$400,000 at June 30, 2015. This money approved for road improvements in the February 10, 2015 council meeting. Adopted Fund Balance Policy requires a minimum of 16.7% of the general fund annual budgeted revenue. At 16.7%, the minimum fund balance allowed based upon our policy would be \$1,645,000 (based on estimated ending revenues in FY2015 of \$9,850,000). Fund balance available ~ **\$500,000** (2,145,746 – 1,645,000). The presentation offered a menu of options for the use of the available \$500,000.

**Options for Funding:**

Pay off the 2005 Sales Tax Bond	\$835,000
(500k from general fund, 335k from park impact fee fund)	
Put money toward a Regional Park/Parks	\$500,000

(Regional park rough cost estimate of  
\$6,000,000 to \$9,000,000)

Hold money in general fund for rainy day

\$0

The presentation expounded on the regional park funding option. City Administration and the City Council is currently vetting out options for a regional park location in our City. There is \$1,960,461 from the sale of Jensen Park land. This money must be spent within 6 years of receipt (October 2013). There is an estimated increase in park impact fund balance of \$308,242 for FY2015. Total estimated ending balance in park impact fees at June 30, 2015 = \$2,268,242. If \$500,000 was dedicated to a regional park, there would be a \$2,768,242 as a starting balance. If \$500,000 fund balance plus \$335,000 of impact fee funds were used to pay down debt, the starting balance we would have would be \$1,933,242; this could delay the start of a park or greatly impact how much park the City could develop. It could take three to five years to collect \$835,000 in impact fees (could be longer depending on development). Delaying the development of the park will result in increased costs associated with higher land prices and higher construction costs. The 10 year CPI average is a 2.1% annual increase. If the 2.1% CPI per year for is calculated over three years, the CPI increase would be estimated at 6.3%; a 6.3% increase in a \$7,000,000 project would be \$210,000. In this scenario, the City would see a net loss of \$101,125 by paying down debt. (210,000 increase in cost – 108,875 savings in interest). Additional funding for the park could include: sale of excess land in city; private donations; fundraising; ongoing Park Impact Fees (phasing of park); and debt and/or tax increase. The estimated timeline for design and construction of a regional park is as follows:

- FY2015 – Complete parks master plan, identify potential location of park.
- FY2016 - Due diligence on real estate transaction, feasibility study, fund raising, and park design.
- FY2017 – RFP for Bids, begin park construction.

The presentation then covered the early bond payment option. The City currently owes \$985,000 on 2005 sales tax bond. The current payment budgeted is for \$150,000 principal plus \$41,253 interest; this leaves a balance owed of \$835,000 with final payment in 2020. The total remaining interest would be \$108,875 if not paid early. Debt is currently funded through 50% transfer from secondary water fund and 50% from park impact fee fund. There is a proposal to fund 50% from general fund instead of from secondary water fund. Remaining 50% still be paid with park impact fee funds; this would free up approximately \$95,000 per year from secondary water fund. This would resolve 2/3 of our deficit in the secondary water fund currently budgeted at \$-156,302. The new deficit would be reduced to approximately \$-61,300 (156,302 – 95,000).

The Council discussed and debated the two options that were discussed in the PowerPoint presentation, with a focus on the impacts to the City's secondary water fund and park development fund that would result from paying off the Jensen Park bond early. Councilmember Peterson suggested a compromise where the City could dedicate a large sum of money to the early payment of debt while not completely paying the debt off, while also dedicating some funding to some of the park improvement priorities recommended by the City's Parks Advisory Committee. The Council discussed and debated the compromise suggested by Councilmember Peterson, but Mayor Palmer ultimately offered to support the recommendation made by Councilmembers Duncan, Johnson, and Lisonbee to pay off the Jensen Park bond early rather than dedicating the \$500,000 general fund surplus to the construction of a regional park.

[8:40:52 PM](#)

## **Concept Plan review for Monterey Estates Phases 6 and**

### **7.**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director explained Syracuse City staff has conducted a concept review for Monterey Estates Phase 6-7. Please review the following information. Any questions regarding this agenda item may be directed at Jenny Schow, City Planner.

Pre-Application Date:	December 10, 2014
Subdivision Name:	Monterey Estates Phase 6-7
Location:	1500 W 700 S
Zoning:	R-3
Total Area:	14.32 Acres
Net Developable Acres:	11.46 acres
Density Allowed:	62 lots
Density Requested:	52 lots

Staff is providing this report in accordance with Syracuse City Code Section 8.20.030:

**8.20.030 Pre-Application Review.**

The developer shall meet with City staff to review the plan of the proposed subdivision. The pre-application meeting shall be attended by staff from applicable city departments, special service districts, county agency and others as deemed necessary by the Community Development Director.

The Community Development Director shall report to the Planning Commission and City Council of pre-application meetings during regular work sessions.

8:41:03 PM

City Planner Schow reviewed the staff memo.

8:44:09 PM

**Sewer System Management Plan presentation**

A staff memo from the Public Works Director explained Syracuse City has developed an SSMP in compliance with Utah Administrative Code R317-801. The main purpose of the SSMP is to provide a plan and schedule to properly manage, operate, and maintain all parts of the sewer collection system to reduce, prevent, and minimize the impact of any sanitary sewer overflows.

8:44:19 PM

Public Works Director Whiteley summarized his staff memo and noted he will draft a resolution to be added to the next Council business meeting agenda to allow for adoption of the updated Sewer System Management Plan.

8:50:14 PM

**Efficiency Audit update**

A memo from the City Manager explained the City advertised for proposals to conduct a General Management and Operational Performance Study, with a deadline of February 19, 2015. A subcommittee of the City Council, consisting of Mayor Palmer, Karianne Lisonbee, Doug Peterson, Brody Bovero, and Steve Marshall was established to develop an RFP and to evaluate the proposals. The subcommittee will meet on the morning of Tuesday, February 24 to evaluate the proposals. The subcommittee will report its findings and recommendation at the February 24 work session. It is anticipated that the subcommittee will have a final recommended firm for the City Council to approve at the March 10 Council Meeting.

8:50:19 PM

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo.

8:51:12 PM

The Council discussed the two proposals that have been identified as the two that would provide the best service and pricing to the City. Councilmember Peterson stated he feels the firms are equal and he would prefer that the firm with the lower cost be selected. Councilmember Lisonbee stated she would prefer the other firm because their proposal is more comprehensive. She asked that the entire Council be given an opportunity to review both proposals in depth and be prepared to provide a recommendation during the March 10 meeting.

8:55:41 PM

**Council business**

The Council and Mayor provided brief reports regarding the activities they have participated in since the last City Council meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

---

Terry Palmer  
Mayor

---

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC  
City Recorder

City Council Work Session  
February 24, 2015

Date approved: March 10, 2015